

MORE ℓ_r SATURATED $\mathcal{L}^\infty$ SPACES

I. GASPARIS, M.K. PAPADIAMANTIS, AND D.Z. ZISIMOPOULOU

ABSTRACT. Given $r \in (1, \infty)$, we construct a new $\mathcal{L}^\infty$ separable Banach space which is ℓ_r saturated .

1. INTRODUCTION

The Bourgain-Delbaen spaces [7] are examples of separable $\mathcal{L}^\infty$ spaces containing no isomorphic copy of c_0 . They have played a key role in the solution of the scalar-plus-compact problem by Argyros and Haydon [3], where a Hereditarily Indecomposable $\mathcal{L}^\infty$ space is presented with the property that every operator on the space is a compact perturbation of a scalar multiple of the identity.

There has recently been an interest in the study $\mathcal{L}^\infty$ spaces of the Bourgain-Delbaen type. Freeman, Odell and Schlumprecht [8] showed that every Banach space with separable dual is isomorphic to a subspace of a $\mathcal{L}^\infty$ space having a separable dual. The aim of this paper is to present a method of constructing, for every $1 < r < \infty$, a new $\mathcal{L}^\infty$ space which is ℓ_r saturated. Our approach shares common features with the Argyros-Haydon work. More precisely we combine, as in [3], the Bourgain-Delbaen method [7] yielding exotic $\mathcal{L}^\infty$ spaces, with the Tsirelson type norms that are equivalent to some ℓ_r norm (see [2], [4], [5]). Recall that in [9], the original Bourgain-Delbaen spaces $\mathfrak{X}_{a,b}$ with $a < 1$, $b < \frac{1}{2}$ and $a + b > 1$ where shown to be ℓ_p saturated for p determined by the formulas $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$ and $a^q + b^q = 1$.

This paper is organized as follows. In the second section, for a given $r \in (1, \infty)$, we construct a Banach space $\mathfrak{X}_r$. To do this, we first choose $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $n > 1$, and a finite sequence $\bar{b} = (b_1, b_2, \dots, b_n)$ of positive real numbers with $b_1 < 1$, $b_2, b_3, \dots, b_n < \frac{1}{2}$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^n b_i^{r'} = 1$ and $\frac{1}{r} + \frac{1}{r'} = 1$. The definition of $\mathfrak{X}_r$ combines the Bourgain-Delbaen method with the Tsirelson type space $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{A}_n, \bar{b})$ which will be later proved to be isomorphic to ℓ_r . In particular, if $b_1 = b_2 = \dots = b_n = \theta$, $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{A}_n, \bar{b})$ coincides with $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{A}_n, \theta)$ and the latter is known to be isomorphic to ℓ_p for some $p \in (1, \infty)$ (see [4]). It is worth noticing that for $n = 2$ the spaces $\mathfrak{X}_r$ essentially coincide with the original Bourgain-Delbaen spaces $\mathfrak{X}_{a,b}$. Thus, our construction of $\mathcal{L}^\infty$ spaces which are ℓ_r saturated spaces, can be considered as a generalization of the Bourgain-Delbaen method. We must point out here that when $n = 2$,

¹2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification*: 05D10, 46B03

Key words and phrases. Banach theory, ℓ_p saturated, $\mathcal{L}^\infty$ spaces.

our proof of the fact that $\mathfrak{X}_r$ is ℓ_r saturated, differs from Haydon's (see [9]) corresponding one for $\mathfrak{X}_{a,b}$. To be more specific, $\mathfrak{X}_r$ has a natural FDD (M_k) . Given a normalized skipped block basis (u_k) of (M_k) with the supports of the u_k 's lying far enough apart, then it is not hard to check that (u_k) dominates (e_k) , the natural basis of $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{A}_n, \bar{b})$. The same holds for every normalized block basis of (u_k) . To obtain a normalized block basis of (u_k) equivalent to (e_k) , we select a sequence $I_1 < I_2 < \dots$ of successive finite subsets of $\mathbb{N}$ such that $\lim_k \|\sum_{i \in I_k} u_i\| = \infty$. Such a choice is possible by the domination of (e_k) by (u_k) . We set $v_k = \|\sum_{i \in I_k} u_i\|^{-1} \sum_{i \in I_k} u_i$ and show that some subsequence of (v_k) is dominated by (e_k) . To accomplish this we adapt the method of the analysis of the members of a finite block basis of (e_k) with respect to a functional in the natural norming set of $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{A}_n, \bar{b})$ (see [6]), to the context of the present construction. We believe that this approach yields a more transparent proof than Haydon's, at least for the upper ℓ_r estimate.

The rest of the paper is devoted to the proof of the main property, namely that $\mathfrak{X}_r$ is ℓ_r saturated. In Section 3, we define the tree analysis of the functionals $\{e_\gamma^* : \gamma \in \Gamma\}$ which is a 1-norming subset of the unit ball of $\mathfrak{X}_r^*$. The tree analysis is similar to the corresponding one used in the Tsirelson and mixed Tsirelson spaces [4]. In the following two sections we establish the lower and upper norm estimates for certain block sequences in the space $\mathfrak{X}_r$.

In the final section we show that every block basis of (M_k) admits a further normalized block basis (x_k) such that every normalized block basis of (x_k) is equivalent to the natural basis of the space $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{A}_n, \bar{b})$. Zippin's theorem [12] yields the desired result.

2. PRELIMINARIES

In this section we define the space $\mathfrak{X}_r$ combining the Bourgain-Delbaen construction [7] and the Tsirelson type constructions [2], [4].

Before proceeding, we recall some notation and terminology from [3]. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $0 < b_1, b_2, \dots, b_n < 1$ with $\sum_{i=1}^n b_i > 1$ and there exists $r' \in (1, \infty)$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^n b_i^{r'} = 1$. We may also assume without loss of generality that $b_1 > b_2 > \dots > b_n$. We define $W[(\mathcal{A}_n, \bar{b})]$ to be the smallest subset W of $c_{00}(\mathbb{N})$ with the following properties:

- (1) $\pm e_k^* \in W$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$,
- (2) whenever $f_i \in W$ and $\max \text{supp } f_i < \min \text{supp } f_{i+1}$ for all i , we have $\sum_{i \leq a} b_i f_i \in W$, provided that $a \leq n$,

We say that an element f of $W[(\mathcal{A}_n, \bar{b})]$ is of Type 0 if $f = \pm e_k^*$ for some k and of Type I otherwise; an element of Type I is said to have weight b_a for some $a \leq n$ if $f = \sum_{i=1}^a f_i$ for a suitable sequence (f_i) of successive elements of $W[(\mathcal{A}_n, \bar{b})]$.

The *Tsirelson space* $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{A}_n, \bar{b})$ is defined to be the completion of c_{00} with

respect to the norm

$$\|x\| = \sup\{\langle f, x \rangle : f \in W[\mathcal{A}_n, \bar{b}]\}.$$

We may also characterize the norm of this space implicitly as being the smallest function $x \mapsto \|x\|$ satisfying

$$\|x\| = \max \left\{ \|x\|_\infty, \sup \sum_{i=1}^n b_i \|E_i x\| \right\},$$

where the supremum is taken over all sequences of finite subsets $E_1 < E_2 < \dots < E_n$.

We shall now present the fundamental aspects related to the Bourgain-Delbaen construction.

For the interested readers we mention that the following method can be characterized as the "dual" construction of the construction presented in [3]. This characterization is based on the fact that in [3] a particular kind of basis is given to $\ell_1(\Gamma)$ and the Bourgain-Delbaen type space X is seen as the predual of its dual, which is $\ell_1(\Gamma)$.

Let $(\Gamma_q)_{q \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a strictly increasing sequence of finite sets and denote their union by Γ ; $\Gamma = \cup_{q \in \mathbb{N}} \Gamma_q$.

We set $\Delta_0 = \Gamma_0$ and $\Delta_q = \Gamma_q \setminus \Gamma_{q-1}$ for $q = 1, 2, \dots$

Assume furthermore that to each $\gamma \in \Delta_q$, $q \geq 1$, we have assigned a linear functional $c_\gamma^* : \ell^\infty(\Gamma_{q-1}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Next, for $n < m$ in $\mathbb{N}$, we define by induction, a linear operator $i_{n,m} : \ell^\infty(\Gamma_n) \rightarrow \ell^\infty(\Gamma_m)$ as follows:

For $m = n + 1$, we define $i_{n,n+1} : \ell^\infty(\Gamma_n) \rightarrow \ell^\infty(\Gamma_{n+1})$ by the rule

$$(i_{n,n+1}(x))(\gamma) = \begin{cases} x(\gamma), & \text{if } \gamma \in \Gamma_n \\ c_\gamma^*(x), & \text{if } \gamma \in \Delta_{n+1} \end{cases}$$

for every $x \in \ell^\infty(\Gamma_n)$.

Then assuming that $i_{n,m}$ has been defined, we set $i_{n,m+1} = i_{m,m+1} \circ i_{n,m}$. A direct consequence of the above definition is that for $n < l < m$ it holds that $i_{n,m} = i_{l,m} \circ i_{n,l}$. Finally we denote by $i_n : \ell^\infty(\Gamma_n) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^\Gamma$ the direct limit $i_n = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} i_{n,m}$.

We assume that there exists a $C > 0$ such that for every $n < m$ we have $\|i_{n,m}\| \leq C$. This implies that $\|i_n\| \leq C$ and therefore $i_n : \ell^\infty(\Gamma_n) \rightarrow \ell^\infty(\Gamma)$ is a bounded linear map. In particular, setting $X_n = i_n[\ell^\infty(\Gamma_n)]$, we have that $X_n \stackrel{C}{\approx} \ell^\infty(\Gamma_n)$ and furthermore $(X_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is an increasing sequence of subspaces of $\ell^\infty(\Gamma)$. We also set $\mathfrak{X}_{BD} = \overline{\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} X_n} \hookrightarrow \ell^\infty(\Gamma)$ equipped with the supremum norm. Evidently, $\mathfrak{X}_{BD}$ is an $\mathcal{L}^\infty$ space.

Let us denote by $r_n : \ell^\infty(\Gamma) \rightarrow \ell^\infty(\Gamma_n)$ the natural restriction map, i.e. $r_n(x) = x|_{\Gamma_n}$. We will also abuse notation and denote by $r_n : \ell^\infty(\Gamma_m) \rightarrow \ell^\infty(\Gamma_n)$ the restriction function from $\ell^\infty(\Gamma_m)$ to $\ell^\infty(\Gamma_n)$ for $n < m$.

Notation 2.1.

- (i) We denote by e_γ^* the restriction of the unit vector $e_\gamma \in \ell^1(\Gamma)$ on the space $\mathfrak{X}_{BD}$.
- (ii) We also extend the functional $c_\gamma^* : \ell^\infty(\Gamma_n) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ to a functional $c_\gamma^* : \mathfrak{X}_{BD} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by the rule $c_\gamma^*(x) = (c_\gamma^* \circ r_{q-1})(x)$ when $\gamma \in \Delta_q$.

As it is well known from [3] and [7], instead of the Schauder basis of $\mathfrak{X}_{BD}$, it is more convenient to work with a FDD naturally defined as follows:

For each $q \in \mathbb{N}$ we set $M_q = i_q[\ell^\infty(\Delta_q)]$.

We briefly establish this fact in the following proposition and then continue with the details of the construction of $\mathfrak{X}_r$.

Proposition 2.2. The sequence $(M_q)_{q \in \mathbb{N}}$ is a FDD for $\mathfrak{X}_{BD}$.

Proof. For $q \geq 0$ we define the maps $P_{\{q\}} : \mathfrak{X}_{BD} \rightarrow M_q$ with

$$P_{\{q\}}(x) = i_q(r_q(x)) - i_{q-1}(r_{q-1}(x))$$

It is easy to check that each $P_{\{q\}}$ is a projection onto M_q and that for $q_1 \neq q_2$ and $x \in M_{q_2}$ we have $P_{\{q_1\}}(x) = 0$. Also we have that $\|P_q\| \leq 2C$. We point out that in a similar manner one can define projections on intervals of the form $I = (p, q]$ so that $P_I(x) = \sum_{i=p+1}^q P_{\{i\}}(x)$ for which we can readily verify the formula

$$P_I(x) = i_q(r_q(x)) - i_p(r_p(x))$$

Note that $\|P_I\| \leq 2C$. This shows that indeed $(M_q)_q$ is a FDD generating $\mathfrak{X}_{BD}$. $\square$

For $x \in \mathfrak{X}_{BD}$ we denote by $\text{supp } x$ the set $\text{supp } x = \{q : P_{\{q\}}(x) \neq 0\}$ and by $\text{ran } x$ the minimal interval of $\mathbb{N}$ containing $\text{supp } x$.

Definition 2.3. A block sequence $(x_i)_{i=1}^\infty$ in $\mathfrak{X}_{BD}$ is called *skipped* (with respect to $(M_q)_{q \in \mathbb{N}}$), if there is a subsequence $(q_i)_{i=1}^\infty$ of $\mathbb{N}$ so that for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$, $\max \text{supp } x_i < q_i < \min \text{supp } x_{i+1}$.

In the sequel, when we refer to a skipped block sequence, we consider it to be with respect to the FDD $(M_q)_{q \in \mathbb{N}}$.

Let $q \geq 0$. For all $\gamma \in \Delta_q$ we set $d_\gamma^* = e_\gamma \circ P_{\{q\}}$. Then the family $(d_\gamma^*)_{\gamma \in \Gamma}$ consists of the biorthogonal functionals of the FDD $(M_q)_{q \geq 0}$. Notice that for $\gamma \in \Delta_q$,

$$\begin{aligned} d_\gamma^*(x) &= P_q(x)(\gamma) = i_q(r_q(x))(\gamma) - i_{q-1}(r_{q-1}(x))(\gamma) = \\ &= r_q(x)(\gamma) - c_\gamma^*(r_{q-1}(x)) = x(\gamma) - c_\gamma^*(x) = \\ &= e_\gamma^*(x) - c_\gamma^*(x). \end{aligned}$$

The sequences $(\Delta_q)_{q \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(c_\gamma^*)_{\gamma \in \Gamma}$ are determined as in [3], section 4 and Theorem 3.5.

We give some useful notation. For fixed $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\bar{b} = (b_1, b_2, \dots, b_n)$ with $0 < b_1, b_2, \dots, b_n < 1$, for each $\gamma \in \Delta_q$ we assign

- (a) $\text{rank } \gamma = q$

- (b) age of γ denoted by $a(\gamma) = a$ such that $2 \leq a \leq n$
- (c) weight of γ denoted by $w(\gamma) = b_a$

In order to proceed to the construction, we first need to fix a positive integer n and a descending sequence of positive real numbers $b_1, \dots, b_n$ such that $b_1 < 1$, $b_i < \frac{1}{2}$, for every $i = 2, \dots, n$ and $\sum_{i=1}^n b_i > 1$. Let $r \in (1, \infty)$ be such that $\sum_{i=1}^n b_i^{r'} = 1$ and $\frac{1}{r} + \frac{1}{r'} = 1$. Now we shall define the space $\mathfrak{X}_r$ by using the Bourgain-Delbaen construction that was presented in the preceding paragraphs.

We set $\Delta_0 = \emptyset$, $\Delta_1 = \{0\}$ and recursively define for each $q > 1$ the set Δ_q .

Assume that Δ_p have been defined for all $p \leq q$. We set

$$\Delta_{q+1} = \left\{ (q+1, a, p, \eta, \varepsilon e_\xi^*) : 2 \leq a \leq n, p \leq q, \varepsilon = \pm 1, e_\xi^* \in S_{\ell^1(\Gamma_q)}, \xi \in \Gamma_q \setminus \Gamma_p, \right. \\ \left. \eta \in \Gamma_p, b_{a-1} = w(\eta) \right\}$$

For $\gamma \in \Delta_{q+1}$ it is clear that the first coordinate is the rank of γ , while the second is the age $a(\gamma)$ of γ . The functionals $(c_\gamma^*)_{\gamma \in \Delta_{q+1}}$ are defined in a way that depends on $\gamma \in \Delta_{q+1}$. Namely, let $x \in \ell^\infty(\Gamma_q)$.

- (i) For $\gamma = (q+1, 2, p, \eta, \varepsilon e_\xi^*)$ we set

$$c_\gamma^*(x) = b_1 x(\eta) + b_2 \varepsilon e_\xi^*(x - i_{p,q}(r_p(x))).$$

- (ii) For $\gamma = (q+1, a, p, \eta, \varepsilon e_\xi^*)$ with $a > 2$ we set

$$c_\gamma^*(x) = x(\eta) + b_a \varepsilon e_\xi^*(x - i_{p,q}(r_p(x))).$$

We may now define sequences (i_q) , (Γ_q) , (X_q) in a similar manner as before and set $\mathfrak{X}_r = \overline{\bigcup_{q \in \mathbb{N}} X_q}$. Assuming that (i_q) is uniformly bounded by a constant C , we conclude that the space $\mathfrak{X}_r$ is a subspace of $\ell_\infty(\Gamma)$. The constant C is determined as in [3] Theorem 3.4, by taking $C = \frac{1}{1-2b_2}$. Thus, for every $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $\|i_m\| \leq C$. This implies that $\|P_I\| \leq 2C$ for every I interval.

Remark 2.4. In the case of $n = 2$, i.e. $\bar{b} = (b_1, b_2)$, the space $\mathfrak{X}_r$ essentially coincides with the Bourgain-Delbaen space $\mathfrak{X}_{b_1, b_2}$, since every $\gamma \in \Gamma$ is of age 2.

Remark 2.5. As it is shown in Proposition 6.2, the choice of r , based on the fixed n and $\bar{b}$, yields that $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{A}_n, \bar{b}) \cong \ell_r$. Moreover, the ingredients of the "Tsirelson type spaces" theory that are used throughout this paper are essentially the same with the corresponding ones in [3]. The basic difference in our approach is that we use only one family $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{A}_n, \bar{b})$ for some appropriate n and $\bar{b}$.

3. THE TREE ANALYSIS OF e_γ^* FOR $\gamma \in \Gamma$

We begin by recalling the analysis of e_γ^* in [3] section 4. The only difference is that in our case all the functionals e_γ^* have weight depending on their age which is greater or equal to 2.

3.1. The evaluation Analysis of e_γ^* for $\gamma \in \Gamma$. First we point out that for $q \in \mathbb{N}$ every $\gamma \in \Delta_{q+1}$ admits a unique analysis as follows:

Let $a(\gamma) = a \leq n$. Then using backwards induction we determine a sequence of sets $\{p_i, q_i, \varepsilon_i e_{\xi_i}^*\}_{i=1}^a \cup \{\eta_i\}_{i=2}^a$ with the following properties.

- (i) $p_1 < q_1 < \dots < p_a < q_a = q$.
- (ii) $\varepsilon_i = \pm 1$, $\text{rank } \xi_i \in (p_i, q_i]$ for $1 \leq i \leq a$ and $\text{rank } \eta_i = q_i + 1$ for $2 \leq i \leq a$.
- (iii) $\eta_a = \gamma$, $\eta_i = (\text{rank } \eta_i, i, p_i, \eta_{i-1}, \varepsilon_i e_{\xi_i}^*)$ for every $i > 2$
 $\eta_2 = (\text{rank } \eta_2, 2, p_2, \varepsilon_1 \xi_1, \varepsilon_2 e_{\xi_2}^*)$ and $(p_1, q_1] = (1, \text{rank } \xi_1]$.

Definition 3.1. Let $q \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\gamma \in \Gamma_q$. Then the sequence $\{p_i, q_i, \varepsilon_i e_{\xi_i}^*\}_{i=1}^a \cup \{\eta_i\}_{i=2}^a$ satisfying all the above properties will be called the analysis of γ .

Moreover, following similar arguments as in [3] Proposition 4.6 it holds that,

$$e_\gamma^* = \sum_{i=2}^a d_{\eta_i}^* + \sum_{i=1}^a b_i \varepsilon_i e_{\xi_i}^* \circ P_{(p_i, q_i]} = \sum_{i=2}^a e_{\eta_i}^* \circ P_{\{q_i+1\}} + \sum_{i=1}^a b_i \varepsilon_i e_{\xi_i}^* \circ P_{(p_i, q_i]}.$$

We set $g_\gamma = \sum_{i=2}^a d_{\eta_i}^*$ and $f_\gamma = \sum_{i=1}^a b_i \varepsilon_i e_{\xi_i}^* \circ P_{(p_i, q_i]}.$

3.2. The r-Analysis of the functional e_γ^* . Let $r \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\gamma \in \Delta_{q+1}$. Let $a(\gamma) = a \leq n$ and $\{p_i, q_i, \varepsilon_i e_{\xi_i}^*\}_{i=1}^a \cup \{\eta_i\}_{i=2}^a$ the evaluation analysis of γ . We define the r-analysis of e_γ^* as follows:

- (a) If $r \leq p_1$, then the r-analysis of e_γ^* coincides with the evaluation analysis of e_γ^* .
- (b) If $r \geq q_a$, then we assign no r-analysis to e_γ^* and we say that e_γ^* is r-indecomposable.
- (c) If $p_1 < r < q_a$, we define $i_r = \min\{i : r < q_i\}$. Note that this is well-defined. The r-analysis of e_γ^* is the following triplet

$$\{(p_i, q_i]\}_{i \geq i_r}, \{\varepsilon_i \xi_i\}_{i \geq i_r}, \{\eta_i\}_{i \geq \max\{2, i_r\}}.$$

where p_{i_r} is either the same or r in the case that $r > p_{i_r}$.

Next we introduce the tree analysis of e_γ^* which is similar to the tree analysis of a functional in a Mixed Tsirelson space (see [4] Chapter II.1). Notice that the evaluation analysis and the r-analysis of e_γ^* form the first level of the tree analysis that we are about to present.

We start with some notation. We denote by $(\mathcal{T}, " \preceq ")$ a finite partially ordered set which is a tree. Its elements are finite sequences of natural

numbers ordered by the initial segment partial order. For every $t \in \mathcal{T}$, we denote by S_t the immediate successors of t .

Assume now that $(p_t, q_t]_{t \in \mathcal{T}}$ is a tree of intervals of $\mathbb{N}$ such that $t \preceq s$ iff $(p_t, q_t] \supset (p_s, q_s]$ and t, s are incomparable iff $(p_t, q_t] \cap (p_s, q_s] = \emptyset$. For such a family $(p_t, q_t]_{t \in \mathcal{T}}$ and t, s incomparable we shall denote by $t < s$ iff $(p_t, q_t] < (p_s, q_s]$ (i.e. $q_t < p_s$).

3.3. The Tree Analysis of the functional e_γ^* . Let $\gamma \in \Delta_{q+1}$ with $a(\gamma) = a \leq n$. A family of the form $\mathcal{F}_\gamma = \{\xi_t, (p_t, q_t]\}_{t \in \mathcal{T}}$ is called the tree analysis of e_γ^* if the following are satisfied:

- (1) $\mathcal{T}$ is a finite tree with a unique root denoted as $\emptyset$.
- (2) We set $\xi_\emptyset = \gamma, (p_\emptyset, q_\emptyset] = (1, q]$ and let $\{p_i, q_i, \varepsilon_i e_{\xi_i}^*\}_{i=1}^a \cup \{\eta_i\}_{i=2}^a$ the evaluation analysis of $\xi_\emptyset$. Set $S_\emptyset = \{(1), (2), \dots, (a)\}$ and for every $s = (i) \in S_\emptyset$, $\{\xi_s, (p_s, q_s]\} = \{\xi_i, (p_i, q_i]\}$.
- (3) Assume that for a $t \in \mathcal{T}$ $\{\xi_t, (p_t, q_t]\}$ has been defined. There are two cases:

- (a) If $e_{\xi_t}^*$ is p_t -decomposable, let

$$\{(p_i, q_i]\}_{i \geq i_{p_t}}, \{\varepsilon_i \xi_i\}_{i \geq i_{p_t}}, \{\eta_i\}_{i \geq \max\{2, i_{p_t}\}}$$

the p_t analysis of $e_{\xi_t}^*$. We set $S_t = \{(t \smallfrown i) : i \geq i_{p_t}\}$ and

$$S_t^{p_t} = \begin{cases} S_t, & \text{if } \eta_{i_{p_t}} \text{ exists} \\ S_t \setminus \{(t \smallfrown i_{p_t})\}, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Then, for every $s = (t \smallfrown i) \in S_t$, we set $\{\xi_s, (p_s, q_s]\} = \{\xi_i, (p_i, q_i]\}$ where $\{\varepsilon_i \xi_i, (p_i, q_i]\}$ is a member of the p_t analysis of $e_{\xi_t}^*$.

- (b) $e_{\xi_t}^*$ is p_t -indecomposable, then ξ_t consists a maximal node of $\mathcal{F}_\gamma$.

Notation 3.2. For later use we need the following:

For every $t \in \mathcal{T}$ $e_{\xi_t}^* = f_t + g_t$, where $f_t = \sum_{s \in S_t} b_s \varepsilon_s e_{\xi_s}^* \circ P_{(p_s, q_s]}$ and $g_t = \sum_{s \in S_t^{p_t}} d_{\eta_s}^*$ and for $s = (t \smallfrown i) \in S_t^{p_t}$,

$$\eta_{(t \smallfrown i)} = (\text{rank } \eta_{(t \smallfrown i)}, i, p_{(t \smallfrown i)}, \eta_{(t \smallfrown i-1)}, \varepsilon_{(t \smallfrown i)} e_{\xi_{(t \smallfrown i)}}^*).$$

In the rest of the paper, we set $f_t = f_{\xi_t}$ and $g_t = g_t$.

Lemma 3.3. Let $x \in \mathfrak{X}_r$ and $\gamma \in \Gamma$. Then,

$$e_\gamma^*(x) = \prod_{\emptyset \preceq s \preceq t_x} (\varepsilon_s b_s)(f_{t_x} + g_{t_x})(x),$$

where $t_x = \max\{t : \text{ran } x \subseteq (p_t, q_t]\}$.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{F}_\gamma = \{\xi_t, (p_t, q_t]\}_{t \in \mathcal{T}}$ a tree analysis of γ .

If $\{t : \text{ran } x \subseteq (p_t, q_t]\} = \emptyset$, then $e_\gamma^*(x) = f_\emptyset(x) + g_\emptyset(x)$ and the equality holds.

If $\{t : \text{ran } x \subseteq (p_t, q_t]\} \neq \emptyset$, we can find $\{t_1 \prec t_2 \prec \dots \prec t_m\} \in \mathcal{T}$ such that $t_1 \in S_\emptyset$ and $t_m = t_x$.

For every $t \in \mathcal{T}$ with $t \prec t_x$, $g_t(x) = 0$. Indeed, for every $s \in S_t^{p_t}$, $d_{\eta_s}^*(x) = e_{\eta_s}^* \circ P_{\{q_s+1\}}(x) = 0$ because $\text{ran } x \subseteq (p_{t_x}, q_{t_x}] \subseteq (p_s, q_s]$.

So, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} e_\gamma^*(x) &= f_\emptyset(x) = \sum_{s \in S_\emptyset} b_s \varepsilon_s e_{\xi_s}^* \circ P_{(p_s, q_s]}(x) = b_{t_1} \varepsilon_{t_1} e_{\xi_{t_1}}^*(x) \\ &= b_{t_1} \varepsilon_{t_1} f_{t_1}(x) = b_{t_1} \varepsilon_{t_1} b_{t_2} \varepsilon_{t_2} e_{\xi_{t_2}}^* \circ P_{(p_{t_2}, q_{t_2}]}(x) = b_{t_1} b_{t_2} \varepsilon_{t_1} \varepsilon_{t_2} e_{\xi_{t_2}}^*(x) \\ &= b_{t_1} b_{t_2} \varepsilon_{t_1} \varepsilon_{t_2} f_{t_2}(x) = \dots = \prod_{\emptyset \preceq s \preceq t_x} (\varepsilon_s b_s) (f_{t_x} + g_{t_x})(x) \end{aligned}$$

setting $\varepsilon_\emptyset = b_\emptyset = 1$. $\square$

Corollary 3.4. If $(f_{t_x}, (p_{t_x}, q_{t_x}])$ is a maximal node, then $e_\gamma^*(x) = 0$.

Proof. Let $(f_{t_x}, (p_{t_x}, q_{t_x}])$ be a maximal node. Then $f_{t_x}(x) = 0$ and $g_{t_x}(x) = 0$ and from Lemma 3.3 we deduce that $e_\gamma^*(x) = 0$. $\square$

4. THE LOWER ESTIMATE

Definition 4.1. An $\phi \in W(\mathcal{A}_n, \bar{b})$ is said to be a proper functional if it admits a tree analysis $(\phi_t)_{t \in \mathcal{T}}$ such that for every non-maximal node $t \in \mathcal{T}$ the set $\{\phi_s : s \in S_t\}$ has at least two non-zero elements.

We denote by $W_{pr}(\mathcal{A}_n, \bar{b})$ to be the subset of $W(\mathcal{A}_n, \bar{b})$ consisting of all proper functionals. For every $t \in \mathcal{T}$ it holds that $\phi_t = \sum_{s \in S_t} b_s \phi_s$ with $\{b_s\}_{s \in S_t} \subseteq \{b_1, b_2, \dots, b_n\}$ and $b_\emptyset = 1$.

Lemma 4.2. The set $W_{pr}(\mathcal{A}_n, \bar{b})$ 1-norms the space $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{A}_n, \bar{b})$.

Proof. We shall show that for every $\phi \in W(\mathcal{A}_n, \bar{b})$ there exists $g \in W_{pr}(\mathcal{A}_n, \bar{b})$ such that $|\phi(m)| \leq g(m) \ \forall m \in \mathbb{N}$. Since the basis is 1-unconditional the previous statement yields the result.

To this end, let $\phi \in W(\mathcal{A}_n, \bar{b})$. Then using a tree analysis $\{\phi_t\}_{t \in \mathcal{T}}$ of ϕ we easily see that for every $m \in \text{supp } \phi$, there exists a maximal node $t_m \in \mathcal{T}$ with $\phi_{t_m} = \varepsilon_m e_m^*$ and $\phi(m) = \varepsilon_m \prod_{t < t_m} b_t$.

For every $m \in \text{supp } \phi$ we set $K_m = \{t \in \mathcal{T} : t < t_m \text{ and } \#S_t > 1\}$. Then it is easy to see that the functional $g = \sum_{m \in \text{supp } \phi} (\prod_{t \in K_m} b_t) e_m^*$ is a functional

belonging to $W_{pr}(\mathcal{A}_n, \bar{b})$. Moreover, since $b_t < 1$ for every $t \in \mathcal{T}$ we get that $|\phi(m)| \leq g(m) \ \forall m \in \mathbb{N}$. $\square$

Lemma 4.3. Let $\phi \in W_{pr}(\mathcal{A}_n, \bar{b})$ and $l \in \mathbb{N}$. If $\text{maxsupp } \phi = l$, then $h(\mathcal{T}_\phi) \leq l$.

Proof. Let θ_n be the amount of nodes at the n level of $\mathcal{T}_\phi$. Since ϕ is proper, it holds that $\theta_{n+1} > \theta_n$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Assume to the contrary that $h(\mathcal{T}_\phi) > l$, i.e. $h(\mathcal{T}_\phi) = l + k$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then,

$$\theta_1 = 1, \theta_2 \geq 2, \dots, \theta_{l+k} \geq l + k$$

Since, the $l + k$ level of $\mathcal{T}_\phi$ consists of functionals of the form e_i^* , we deduce that $\text{maxsupp } \phi \geq l + k > l$, which leads to a contradiction. $\square$

Proposition 4.4. Let $(x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a normalized skipped block sequence in $\mathfrak{X}_r$ and $(q_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ a strictly increasing sequence of integers such that $\text{supp } x_k \subset (q_k + k, q_{k+1})$. Then, for every sequence of positive scalars $(a_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ and for every $l \in \mathbb{N}$, it holds that

$$(1) \quad \left\| \sum_{k=1}^l a_k e_k \right\|_{\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{A}_n, \bar{b})} \leq C \left\| \sum_{k=1}^l a_k x_k \right\|_\infty$$

where $(e_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subseteq \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{A}_n, \bar{b})$ and C is an upper bound for the norms of the operators i_m in $\mathfrak{X}_r$.

Proof. Let $\phi \in W(\mathcal{A}_n, \bar{b})$. From Lemma 4.2 we may assume that ϕ is proper. We will use induction on the height of the tree $\mathcal{T}_\phi$.

If $h(\mathcal{T}_\phi) = 0$ (i.e. ϕ is maximal), then ϕ is of the form $\phi = \varepsilon_k e_k^*$ with $\varepsilon_k = \pm 1$. We observe that, $|\phi(\sum_{k=1}^l a_k e_k)| = |a_k| = a_k$. From [3] Proposition 4.8, we can choose $\gamma \in \Gamma_{q_{k+1}-1} \setminus \Gamma_{q_k+k}$ such that $|x_k(\gamma)| \geq \frac{1}{C} \|x_k\| = \frac{1}{C}$. Then, $|\phi(\sum_{k=1}^l a_k e_k)| = a_k \leq C |a_k| |x_k(\gamma)| = C |e_\gamma^*(a_k x_k)| \leq C |e_\gamma^*(\sum_{k=1}^l a_k x_k)|$.

We assume that for every $\phi \in W(\mathcal{A}_n, \bar{b})$ with $h(\mathcal{T}_\phi) = h > 0$ and $\text{maxsupp } \phi = l_0$, there exists $\gamma \in \Gamma$, such that:

- (1) $\gamma \in \Gamma_{q_{l_0+1}+h} \setminus \Gamma_{q_{l_0+1}}$
- (2) $h(\mathcal{T}_\phi) = h(\mathcal{F}_\gamma) \leq l_0$
- (3) $|\phi(\sum_{k=1}^l a_k e_k)| \leq C |\sum_{k=1}^l a_k x_k(\gamma)|$ for every $l \geq l_0$

Observe that assumption (1) yields $x_{l_0} < \text{rank } \gamma < x_{l_0+1}$, while assumption (2) gives us that $\text{minsupp } x_{l_0+1} - \text{maxsupp } x_{l_0} > h(\mathcal{T}_\phi)$. Indeed,

$$x_{l_0} < q_{l_0+1} < \text{rank } \gamma \leq q_{l_0+1} + h \leq q_{l_0+1} + l_0 < q_{l_0+1} + (l_0 + 1) < x_{l_0+1}$$

$$\text{and } \text{minsupp } x_{l_0+1} - \text{maxsupp } x_{l_0} > l_0 + 1 > l_0 \geq h(\mathcal{F}_\gamma).$$

Let $\phi \in W(\mathcal{A}_n, \bar{b})$ with $h(\mathcal{T}_\phi) = h + 1$, $l_0 = \text{maxsupp } \phi$ and let $(\phi_t)_{t \in \mathcal{T}}$ the tree analysis of ϕ . Then, ϕ is of the form $\phi = \sum_{s \in S_\emptyset} b_s \phi_s$, $\#S_\emptyset \leq n$. We observe that for every $s \in S_\emptyset$, $h(\mathcal{T}_{\phi_s}) = h$. We set $p_1 = 1$, for every $s \in S_\emptyset \setminus \{1\}$ $p_s = \min\{q_k + k : k \in \text{supp } \phi_s\}$ and for every $s \in S_\emptyset$, $r_s = q_{l_s+1} + h$ where $l_s = \text{maxsupp } \phi_s$.

We next apply the inductive hypothesis to obtain $\xi_s \in \Gamma_{r_s} \setminus \Gamma_{q_{l_s}+1}$ with $h(\mathcal{T}_{\phi_s}) = h(\mathcal{F}_{\xi_s})$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} |\phi_s(\sum_{k=1}^l a_k e_k)| &= |\phi_s(\sum_{k \in \text{supp } \phi_s} a_k e_k)| \leq C \varepsilon_s \sum_{k \in \text{supp } \phi_s} a_k x_k(\xi_s) \\ &= C \varepsilon_s e_{\xi_s}^* (\sum_{k \in \text{supp } \phi_s} a_k x_k) = C \varepsilon_s e_{\xi_s}^* \circ P_{(p_s, r_s]} (\sum_{k=1}^l a_k x_k), \end{aligned}$$

with ε_s such that $\varepsilon_s e_{\xi_s}^* (\sum_{k \in \text{supp } \phi_s} a_k x_k) = |\sum_{k \in \text{supp } \phi_s} a_k x_k(\xi_s)|$.

Let $\gamma \in \Gamma$ have analysis $\{p_s, r_s, \varepsilon_s e_{\xi_s}^*\}_{s \in S_\emptyset} \cup \{\eta_s\}_{s \in S_\emptyset \setminus \{1\}}$ where $\eta_s \in \Delta_{r_s+1}$. Observe that $\text{rank } \xi_s \in (q_{l_s+1}, r_s] \subset (p_s, r_s]$. It is clear that for every $s \in S_\emptyset \setminus \{1\}$, $d_{\eta_s}^*(\sum_{k=1}^l a_k x_k) = 0$. Indeed,

$$\text{supp } x_{l_s} < q_{l_s+1} < q_{l_s+1} + (h+1) = r_s + 1 \leq q_{l_s+1} + (l_s + 1) < \text{supp } x_{l_s+1}.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} |\phi(\sum_{k=1}^l a_k e_k)| &\leq \sum_{s \in S_\emptyset} |b_s \phi_s(\sum_{k \in \text{supp } \phi_s} a_k e_k)| \leq C \sum_{s \in S_\emptyset} b_s \varepsilon_s e_{\xi_s}^* \circ P_{(p_s, r_s]}(\sum_{k=1}^l a_k x_k) \\ &\leq C |\sum_{k=1}^l a_k x_k(\gamma)| \end{aligned}$$

It is clear that $h(\mathcal{T}_\phi) = h(\mathcal{F}_\gamma) \leq l_0$ and $x_{l_0} < \text{rank } \gamma < x_{l_0+1}$. $\square$

Corollary 4.5. For every block sequence in $\mathfrak{X}_r$ there exists a further block sequence satisfying inequality (1).

5. THE UPPER ESTIMATE

Let $(y_l)_{l \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a normalized skipped block sequence in $\mathfrak{X}_r$. From Corollary 4.5, we can find a further block sequence of $(y_l)_l$, still denoted by $(y_l)_l$, satisfying inequality (1).

Therefore, we have that

$$\|\sum_{l=1}^m y_l\|_\infty \geq \frac{1}{C} \|\sum_{l=1}^m e_l\|_{\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{A}_n, \bar{b})}$$

For every $j \in \mathbb{N}$, set $M_j = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}^j$. It is easily checked, after identifying M_j with $\{1, \dots, n^j\}$ for every j , that the functional $f_j = \sum_{s \in M_j} (\prod_{i=1}^j b_{s_i}) e_s^*$ belongs to $W(\mathcal{A}_n, \bar{b})$ where s_i is the i -th coordinate of s , for each $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ and $\sum_{s \in M_j} \prod_{i=1}^j b_{s_i} = (\sum_{i=1}^n b_i)^j$. Using the fact that $\#M_j = n^j$, we obtain that

$$\|\sum_{l=1}^{n^j} e_l\|_{\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{A}_n, \bar{b})} = \|\sum_{s \in M_j} e_s\|_{\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{A}_n, \bar{b})} \geq f_j(\sum_{l=1}^{n^j} e_l) = (\sum_{i=1}^n b_i)^j.$$

Also, for every $m \in \mathbb{N}$ large enough we may find $j \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $n^{j+1} > m \geq n^j$. From the above and the unconditionality of the basis of the space $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{A}_n, \bar{b})$, it follows that

$$\|\sum_{l=1}^m y_l\|_\infty \geq \frac{1}{C} \|\sum_{l=1}^m e_l\|_{\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{A}_n, \bar{b})} \geq \frac{1}{C} \|\sum_{l=1}^{n^j} e_l\|_{\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{A}_n, \bar{b})} = (\sum_{i=1}^n b_i)^j$$

We conclude that $\|\sum_{l=1}^m y_l\|_\infty \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow \infty} \infty$ as $\sum_{i=1}^n b_i > 1$.

We next choose a further block sequence $(x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ of $(y_l)_{l \in \mathbb{N}}$ with some additional properties. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and choose a descending sequence $(\varepsilon_k)_k$ of positive reals such that $(\sum_{k=1}^\infty \varepsilon_k) < \varepsilon$. We can also find an increasing

sequence $(n_k)_k$ of positive integers and a sequence $(F_k)_k$ of successive subsets of $\mathbb{N}$ such that the following are satisfied:

- (1) For every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\frac{1}{n_k} < \varepsilon_k$.
- (2) For every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\|\sum_{l \in F_k} y_l\| > n_k$. This is possible, due to the above notation.

We have thus constructed a normalized skipped block sequence $(x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ of the form $x_k = \sum_{l \in F_k} \lambda_l y_l$, where $\lambda_l = \frac{1}{\|\sum_{l \in F_k} y_l\|}$. Notice that $|\lambda_l| < \varepsilon_k$ for every $l \in F_k$.

Let $\gamma \in \Gamma$ with tree analysis $\mathcal{F}_\gamma = \{\xi_t, (p_t, q_t)\}_{t \in \mathcal{T}}$.

For every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we set $t_k = \max\{t : \text{ran } x_k \subset (p_t, q_t]\}$. Notice that if for a given x_k , t_k is non-maximal, then there exist at least two immediate successors of t_k , say s_1, s_2 such that the corresponding intervals $(p_{s_1}, q_{s_1}]$, $(p_{s_2}, q_{s_2}]$ intersect $\text{ran } x_k$. For later use we shall denote by $(p_{s_0}, q_{s_0}]$ the first interval in the natural order of disjoint segments of the natural numbers that intersects x_k . Notice that s_0 is not necessarily the first element of S_t . For the pair $\gamma, (x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ and for every $t \in \mathcal{T}$ we define the following sets: $D_t = \bigcup_{s \geq t} \{k : s = t_k\}$, $K_t = D_t \setminus \bigcup_{s \in S_t} D_s = \{k : t = t_k\}$ and $E_t = \{s \in S_t : D_s \neq \emptyset\}$.

We now set $x_k = x'_k + x''_k + x'''_k$ where,

$$x'_k = x_k \mid_{(p_{s_0}, q_{s_0}]}, \quad x''_k = x_k \mid_{\bigcup_{s \in S_{t_k}, s \neq s_0} (p_s, q_s]} \quad \text{and} \quad x'''_k = x_k - x'_k - x''_k.$$

- Remark 5.1.** (1) The sets D_t, K_t, E_t are determined by the chosen pair $\gamma, (x_k)_k$. For a different pair, these sets may differ as well. For example, let $k \in K_t$, for the pair $\gamma, (x_k)_k$. Then $t = t_k$ for x_k . By the construction of x'_k , there exists $s_k \in S_t$ such that $x'_k = x_k \mid_{(p_{s_k}, q_{s_k}]}$. Thus, taking the pair $\gamma, (x'_k)_k$ the same k belongs to K_{s_k} .
- (2) For every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $|g_{t_k}(x_k)| \leq 2Cn\varepsilon_k$.

Indeed, from the definition of $(x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned} |g_{t_k}(x_k)| &\leq \sum_{s \in S_{t_k}^{p_{t_k}}} |d_{\eta_s}^*(x_k)| \leq \sum_{s \in S_{t_k}^{p_{t_k}}} |e_{\eta_s}^* \circ P_{\{q_s+1\}}(\sum_{l \in F_k} \lambda_l y_l)| \leq \\ &\leq \sum_{s \in S_{t_k}^{p_{t_k}}} \|e_{\eta_s}^*\| \|P_{\{q_s+1\}}\| \|\lambda_l^s\| \|y_l^s\| \leq \sum_{s \in S_{t_k}^{p_{t_k}}} 2C\varepsilon_k \leq \\ &\leq 2C\varepsilon_k (\#S_{t_k}) \leq 2Cn\varepsilon_k. \end{aligned}$$

- (3) It is obvious that $g_{t_k}(x_k) = g_{t_k}(x'''_k)$, $f_{t_k}(x'''_k) = 0$ and for every $t \prec t_k$, $g_t(x'''_k) = 0$.

Lemma 5.2. For the pairs $\gamma, (x'_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $\gamma, (x''_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ it holds that $\#(K_t \cup E_t) \leq n$.

Proof. Let $t \in \mathcal{T}$ and let $k \in K_t$.

We set $s_k = \max\{s \in S_t : (p_s, q_s] \cap \text{ran } x'_k \neq \emptyset\}$. From the definition of t_k ,

notice that $\#S_t \geq 2$. It holds that $s_k \notin E_t$.

Indeed, from the definition of t_k, s_k we have that $(p_{t_k}, q_{t_k}] \cap \text{ran } x'_k = \text{ran } x'_k$ and $(p_{s_k}, q_{s_k}] \cap \text{ran } x'_k = (p_{s_k}, q_{s_k}]$. Since $s_k \in S_{t_k}$, $(p_{s_k}, q_{s_k}] \subseteq (p_{t_k}, q_{t_k}]$. It follows that $(p_{s_k}, q_{s_k}] \subseteq \text{ran } x'_k$.

Therefore, we can define a one-to-one map $G : K_t \rightarrow S_t \setminus E_t$, hence $\#K_t + \#E_t \leq \#S_t \leq n$.

The proof for the pair $\gamma, (x''_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is similar. $\square$

Proposition 5.3. Let $(x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be as above. Then for every $\gamma \in \Gamma$ there exist $\phi_1, \phi_2 \in W(\mathcal{A}_n, \bar{b})$ such that for every sequence $(a_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ of positive scalars, for every $l \in \mathbb{N}$ it holds that,

$$(2) \quad \left| \sum_{k=1}^l a_k x_k(\gamma) \right| \leq \frac{1}{b_n} (\phi_1 + \phi_2) \left(\sum_{k=1}^l a_k e_k \right) + 2Cn\varepsilon \left(\sum_{k=1}^l a_k^r \right)^{\frac{1}{r}}$$

Proof. Let $\gamma \in \Delta_{q+1}$ with $a(\gamma) = a \leq n$. Let $\mathcal{F}_\gamma = \{\xi_t, (p_t, q_t]\}_{t \in \mathcal{T}}$, where $\xi_\emptyset = \gamma$, be the tree analysis of γ . We may assume that $\bigcup_{k=1}^l \text{ran } x_k \subset (p_\emptyset, q_\emptyset]$.

Claim. For the pairs $\gamma, (x'_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $\gamma, (x''_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ there exist $\phi_1, \phi_2 \in W(\mathcal{A}_n, \bar{b})$ such that for every sequence of positive scalars $(a_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ and for every $l \in \mathbb{N}$, it holds that

$$(3) \quad \left| f_\emptyset \left(\sum_{k=1}^l a_k x'_k \right) \right| \leq \frac{2C}{b_n} \phi_1 \left(\sum_{k=1}^l a_k e_k \right)$$

$$(4) \quad \left| f_\emptyset \left(\sum_{k=1}^l a_k x''_k \right) \right| \leq \frac{2C}{b_n} \phi_2 \left(\sum_{k=1}^l a_k e_k \right)$$

Proof of the Claim. We only prove inequality 3. The proof of inequality 4 requires the same arguments. We recall that $f_t = \sum_{s \in S_t} b_s \varepsilon_s (f_s + g_s) \circ P_{(p_s, q_s]}$ for every $t \in \mathcal{T}$ non maximal. From the definition of $(x'_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$, we have that $g_s \circ P_{(p_s, q_s]}(x'_k) = 0$ for every $s \in S_t$. Therefore, $f_t(\sum_{k \in D_t} a_k x'_k) = (\sum_{s \in S_t} b_s \varepsilon_s f_s \circ P_{(p_s, q_s]})(\sum_{k \in D_t} a_k x'_k)$. We will use backwards induction on the levels of the tree $\mathcal{T}$, i.e we shall show that for every $t \in \mathcal{T}$ there exists $\phi_1^t \in W(\mathcal{A}_n, \bar{b})$ with $\text{supp } \phi_1^t \subseteq D_t$ such that

$$\left| f_t \left(\sum_{k \in D_t} a_k x'_k \right) \right| \leq \frac{2C}{b_n} \phi_1^t \left(\sum_{k \in D_t} a_k e_k \right)$$

Let $0 < h \leq \max\{|t| : t \in \mathcal{T}\}$

We assume that the proposition has been proved for all t with $|t| = h$.

Let $t \in \mathcal{T}$ with $|t| = h - 1$. Then we have the following cases:

- (1) If f_t is a maximal node, $f_t(\sum_{k \in D_t} a_k x'_k) = 0$, so there is nothing to prove. Indeed, $K = D_t$, therefore for every $k \in D_t$, from Corollary 3.4 $f_t(x'_k) = 0$ since $t = t_k$.

(2) If f_t is a non-maximal node, then

$$\begin{aligned} f_t(\sum_{k \in D_t} a_k x'_k) &= (\sum_{s \in S_t} b_s \varepsilon_s f_s \circ P_{(p_s, q_s]})(\sum_{k \in D_t} a_k x'_k) = \\ &= \sum_{s \in S_t} b_s \varepsilon_s f_s(\sum_{k \in D_s} a_k x'_k) + \sum_{k \in K} (\sum_{s \in S_t} b_s \varepsilon_s f_s)(a_k x'_k). \end{aligned}$$

From the fact that, for every $k \in K_t$, $g_t(x'_k) = 0$ we get that

$$|f_t(x'_k)| = |x'_k(\xi_t)| \leq \|x'_k\| \leq 2C = 2Ce_k^*(e_k).$$

Moreover, for $s \in E_t$ it holds that $|s| = h - 1$. For every $k \in D_s$, from the inductive hypothesis we obtain

$$|\sum_{s \in S_t} b_s f_s(x'_k)| = |b_s f_s(x'_k)| \leq b_s \frac{2C}{b_n} \phi_1^s(e_k).$$

with $\phi_1^s \in W(\mathcal{A}_n, \bar{b})$ and $\text{supp } \phi_1^s \subseteq D_s$.

We set $\phi_1^t = (\sum_{s \in E_t} b_s \phi_1^s + \sum_{k \in K_t} b_k e_k^*)$.

From Lemma 5.2, it is easily checked that $\phi_1^t \in W(\mathcal{A}_n, \bar{b})$ and it holds that, $|f_t(\sum_{k \in D_t} a_k x'_k)| \leq \frac{2C}{b_n} \phi_1^t(\sum_{k \in D_t} a_k e_k)$.

□

Recall that $e_\gamma^*(\sum_{k=1}^l a_k x_k) = g_\emptyset(\sum_{k=1}^l a_k x_k) + f_\emptyset(\sum_{k=1}^l a_k x_k)$. The fact that $g_\emptyset(\sum_{k=1}^l a_k x'_k) = g_\emptyset(\sum_{k=1}^l a_k x''_k) = g_\emptyset(\sum_{k \in \{m:t_m \neq \emptyset\}} a_k x_k''') = f_\emptyset(\sum_{k \in \{m:t_m = \emptyset\}} a_k x_k''') = 0$ implies the following:

$$\begin{aligned} |e_\gamma^*(\sum_{k=1}^l a_k x_k)| &\leq |g_\emptyset(\sum_{k \in \{m:t_m = \emptyset\}} a_k x_k''')| + |f_\emptyset(\sum_{k=1}^l a_k x'_k)| \\ &\quad + |f_\emptyset(\sum_{k=1}^l a_k x''_k)| + |f_\emptyset(\sum_{k \in \{m:t_m \neq \emptyset\}} a_k x_k''')| \end{aligned}$$

From Remark 5.1 we get that,

$$|g_\emptyset(\sum_{k \in \{m:t_m = \emptyset\}} a_k x_k''')| \leq \sum_{k \in \{m:t_m = \emptyset\}} a_k |g_\emptyset(x_k''')| \leq 2Cn \sum_{k \in \{m:t_m = \emptyset\}} a_k \varepsilon_k.$$

From Lemma 3.3 and Remark 5.1 we have that,

$$\begin{aligned} |f_\emptyset(\sum_{k \in \{m:t_m \neq \emptyset\}} a_k x_k''')| &\leq \sum_{k \in \{m:t_m \neq \emptyset\}} a_k (\prod_{t < t_k} b_t) |g_{t_k}(x_k''')| \leq \\ &\leq 2C \frac{1}{2} n \sum_{k \in \{m:t_m \neq \emptyset\}} a_k \varepsilon_k \leq 2Cn \sum_{k \in \{m:t_m \neq \emptyset\}} a_k \varepsilon_k. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \sum_{k=1}^l a_k x_k(\gamma) \right| &\leq 2Cn \sum_{k \in \{m: t_m = \emptyset\}} a_k \varepsilon_k + \frac{2C}{b_n} \phi_1 \left(\sum_{k=1}^l a_k e_k \right) \\
&+ \frac{2C}{b_n} \phi_2 \left(\sum_{k=1}^l a_k e_k \right) + 2Cn \sum_{k \in \{m: t_m \neq \emptyset\}} a_k \varepsilon_k \\
&\leq \frac{2C}{b_n} (\phi_1 + \phi_2) \left(\sum_{k=1}^l a_k e_k \right) + 2Cn \sum_{k=1}^l a_k \varepsilon_k \\
&\leq \frac{2C}{b_n} (\phi_1 + \phi_2) \left(\sum_{k=1}^l a_k e_k \right) + 2Cn \max\{a_k : k \in \mathbb{N}\} \left(\sum_{k=1}^l \varepsilon_k \right) \\
&\leq \frac{2C}{b_n} (\phi_1 + \phi_2) \left(\sum_{k=1}^l a_k e_k \right) + 2Cn \varepsilon \left(\sum_{k=1}^l a_k^r \right)^{\frac{1}{r}}.
\end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality we used the fact that the ℓ_r norm dominates the c_0 norm. $\square$

Remark 5.4. From [4] Theorem I.4, we know that $\|\sum a_k e_k\|_{\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{A}_n, \bar{b})} \geq M(\sum a_k^r)^{\frac{1}{r}}$. This result and the previous Proposition, yield that

$$\left| \sum_{k=1}^l a_k x_k(\gamma) \right| \leq \frac{2C}{b_n} (\phi_1 + \phi_2) \left(\sum_{k=1}^l a_k e_k \right) + \frac{2Cn\varepsilon}{M} \left\| \sum_{k=1}^l a_k e_k \right\|_{\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{A}_n, \bar{b})}.$$

For $\varepsilon = \frac{M}{nb_n}$,

$$\left| \sum_{k=1}^l a_k x_k(\gamma) \right| \leq \frac{6C}{b_n} \left\| \sum_{k=1}^l a_k e_k \right\|_{\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{A}_n, \bar{b})}.$$

Therefore,

$$(5) \quad \left\| \sum_{k=1}^l a_k x_k \right\|_{\infty} \leq \frac{6C}{b_n} \left\| \sum_{k=1}^l a_k e_k \right\|_{\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{A}_n, \bar{b})}.$$

Corollary 5.5. For every block sequence in $\mathfrak{X}_r$ there exists a further block sequence satisfying inequality (5).

6. THE MAIN RESULT

Proposition 6.1. Let $(x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a skipped block sequence in $\mathfrak{X}_r$ satisfying $\text{minsupp } x_{k+1} > \text{maxsupp } x_k + k$ and the conditions of Proposition 5.3. Then $(x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is equivalent to the basis of the Tsirelson space $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{A}_n, \bar{b})$ for n and $\bar{b}$ determined as before.

Proof. It is an immediate consequence of Propositions 4.4, 5.3 and Remark 5.4. $\square$

Proposition 6.2. The space $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{A}_n, \bar{b})$ is isomorphic to ℓ_p for some $p \in (1, \infty)$.

Proof. In a similar manner as in [4] Theorem I.4, one can see that for every normalized block sequence $(x_k)_k$ of the basis $(e_j)_j$ and for every scalar sequence (a_k) it holds that, $\|\sum a_k x_k\| \leq \frac{2}{b_n} \|\sum a_k e_k\|$. Zippin's Theorem [12] yields that $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{A}_n, \bar{b})$ is isomorphic to some ℓ_p for some $p \in (1, \infty)$. $\square$

Remark 6.3. An alternative proof could also be derived using the Results in Sections 4 and 5. Indeed, let $(y_l)_{l \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a skipped block sequence in $\mathfrak{X}_r$. Then, there exists a further block sequence $(x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfying simultaneously the assumptions of Corollaries 4.5 and 5.5. Therefore, $(x_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ satisfies the assumptions of Proposition 6.1.

Let's observe that every further block sequence $(z_k)_k$ of $(x_k)_k$ is also skipped block and satisfies Proposition 6.1, thus it is equivalent to the basis of the space $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{A}_n, \bar{b})$. Hence, every block sequence $(z_n)_n$ of $(x_k)_k$ is equivalent to $(x_k)_k$. Zippin's theorem [12] yields that the space $\overline{\langle (x_k)_k \rangle}$ is isomorphic to some ℓ_p . Therefore, $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{A}_n, \bar{b}) \cong \ell_p$ for some $p \in (1, \infty)$.

In order to determine the exact value of p , we need the following Proposition.

Proposition 6.4. The space $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{A}_n, \bar{b})$ is isomorphic to ℓ_r with $\frac{1}{r} + \frac{1}{r'} = 1$ and $\sum_{i=1}^n b_i^{r'} = 1$.

Proof. First, let observe that for every $x \in c_{00}$, $\|x\| \leq \|x\|_r$. We shall use induction on the cardinality of $\text{supp } x$. If $|\text{supp } x| = 1$, it is trivial. Assume that it holds for every $y \in c_{00}$ with $|\text{supp } y| \leq n$ and let $x \in c_{00}$ with $|\text{supp } x| = n + 1$. Then either $\|x\| = \|x\|_\infty$ or $\|x\| = \sum_{i=1}^n b_i \|E_i x\|$ for some appropriate subsets $E_1 < E_2 < \dots < E_n$. In the first case, there is nothing to prove as for every $p \in [r, \infty)$ $\|x\|_\infty \leq \|x\|_p$. Therefore we only need to deal with the second case.

It suffices to observe that for every $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$, the cardinality of $\text{supp } E_i x$ is less than $\text{supp } x$ and thus, using the inductive hypothesis along with Hölder's inequality, we get that

$$\|x\| \leq \sum_{i=1}^n b_i \|E_i x\|_r \leq \left(\sum_{i=1}^n b_i^{r'} \right)^{\frac{1}{r'}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \|E_i x\|_r^r \right)^{\frac{1}{r}} = \|x\|_r.$$

By combining the preceding argument with Proposition 6.2, we conclude that $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{A}_n, \bar{b})$ is isomorphic to ℓ_p for some $p \in [r, \infty)$.

For every $l \in \mathbb{N}$ set $M_l = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}^l$. We have already mentioned that for every $l \in \mathbb{N}$ the functional $f_l = \sum_{s \in M_l} (\prod_{i=1}^l b_{s_i}) e_s^*$ belongs to $W(\mathcal{A}_n, \bar{b})$ where s_i is the i -th coordinate of s , for each $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ and $\sum_{s \in M_l} \prod_{i=1}^l b_{s_i} = (\sum_{i=1}^n b_i)^l$. We set $a_s = \prod_{i=1}^l b_{s_i}$ and $x_l = \sum_{s \in M_l} a_s^{\frac{r'}{r}} e_s$.

It is easily seen that for every $l \in \mathbb{N}$, $\|x_l\| = 1$. Indeed,

$$\|x_l\| \leq \|x_l\|_r = \left(\sum_{s \in M_l} a_s^{r'} \right)^{\frac{1}{r}} = \left(\sum_{i=1}^n b_i^{r'} \right)^{\frac{1}{r}} = 1 = f_l(x_l) \leq \|x_l\|.$$

We claim that for $p' > r$ and every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $l \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\|x_l\|_{p'} < \varepsilon$. If the claim holds we are done as p coincides with r .

Proof of the Claim: Notice that for $p' > r$, $\sum_{i=1}^n b_i^{\frac{r'}{r}p'} = \sum_{i=1}^n b_i^{r'(1+\delta)}$ for some $0 < \delta < 1$. But for every $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ $b_i < 1$, and therefore

$$\sum_{i=1}^n b_i^{r'(1+\delta)} < \sum_{i=1}^n b_i^{r'} = 1.$$

Thus, there exists $l \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $(\sum_{i=1}^n b_i^{r'(1+\delta)})^l < \varepsilon^{p'}$. Then for this l ,

$$\|x_l\|_{p'} = \left(\sum_{s \in M_l} a_s^{\frac{r'}{r}p'} \right)^{\frac{1}{p'}} = \left(\sum_{s \in M_l} a_s^{r'(1+\delta)} \right)^{\frac{1}{p'}} = \left(\sum_{i=1}^n b_i^{r'(1+\delta)} \right)^{\frac{l}{p'}} < \varepsilon.$$

□

Theorem 6.5. For every $r \in (1, \infty)$ the space $\mathfrak{X}_r$ is ℓ_r saturated.

Proof. As it was mentioned in the above Remark, for every skipped block sequence in $\mathfrak{X}_r$ we can find a further block sequence $(x_k)_k$ such that the space $\overline{\langle (x_k)_k \rangle}$ is isomorphic to ℓ_r . □

Remark 6.6. From the previous Theorem, we deduce that the space $\mathfrak{X}_r$ is a separable $\mathcal{L}^\infty$ space which does not contain ℓ_1 . Therefore, the results of D.Lewis-C.Stegall [10] and A. Pelczyński [11] yields that $\mathfrak{X}_r^*$ is isomorphic to ℓ_1 . Alternatively, one can use the corresponding argument of D. Alspach [1] and show directly that (M_q) is a shrinking FDD for $\mathfrak{X}_r$. It then follows that $(e_\gamma^*)_{\gamma \in \Gamma}$ is a basis for $\mathfrak{X}_r^*$, equivalent to the usual ℓ_1 -basis.

REFERENCES

- [1] D. Alspach, *The dual of the Bourgain-Delbaen space*, Israel J. Math. **117** (2000), 239–259.
- [2] S.A. Argyros and I. Deliyanni, *Banach spaces of the type of Tsirelson*, arXiv (math/9207206v1), (1992).
- [3] S.A. Argyros and R. Haydon, *A Hereditarily Indecomposable $\mathcal{L}^\infty$ -space that solves the scalar-plus-compact problem*, (submitted).
- [4] S.A. Argyros and S. Todorćević, *Ramsey methods in Analysis*, Birkhauser (2005).
- [5] S.F. Bellenot, *Tsirelson superspaces and ℓ_p* , Journal of Funct. Anal., **69** (1986), no. 2, 207–228.
- [6] J. Bernués and I. Deliyanni, *Families of finite subsets of $\mathbb{N}$ of low complexity and Tsirelson type spaces*, Math. Nachr., **222** (2001), 15–29.
- [7] J. Bourgain and F. Delbaen, *A class of special $\mathcal{L}^\infty$ spaces*, Acta Mathematica, **145** (1980), 155–176.
- [8] D. Freeman, E. Odell and Th. Schlumprecht, *The universality of a ℓ_1 as a dual Banach space*, preprint.

- [9] R. Haydon, *Subspaces of the Bourgain-Delbaen space*, Studia Math., **139** (2000), no. 3, 275–293.
- [10] D. Lewis and C. Stegall, *Banach spaces whose duals are isomorphic to $\ell^1(\Gamma)$* , J. Funct. Anal., **12** (1971), 167–177.
- [11] A. Pelczyński, *On Banach spaces containing $L_1(\mu)$* , Studia Math., **30** (1968), 231–246.
- [12] M. Zippin, *On perfectly homogeneous bases in Banach spaces*, Israel J. of Math., **4** (1966), 265–272.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, ARISTOTLE UNIVERSITY OF THESSALONIKI, THESSALONIKI 54124, GREECE

E-mail address: ioagaspa@math.auth.gr

NATIONAL TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY OF ATHENS, FACULTY OF APPLIED SCIENCES, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, ZOGRAFOU CAMPUS, 157 80, ATHENS, GREECE

E-mail address: mpapdiamantis@yahoo.gr

NATIONAL TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY OF ATHENS, FACULTY OF APPLIED SCIENCES, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, ZOGRAFOU CAMPUS, 157 80, ATHENS, GREECE

E-mail address: dzisimopoulou@hotmail.com